

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated September 7, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this Amendment, Applicants amend claim 6 and add new claim 13. Accordingly, claims 6-13 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claim 6 is objected to because of informalities. Applicants believe that in view of the current amendments in claim 6, this objection is now believed to be moot.

In addition, claims 6-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Related Art (ARA) in view of Dingwall et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,307,188). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 6 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 6 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "an upper polarizer on a upper substrate having a color filter layer... wherein the lower polarizer includes a light shielding layer formed in a rectangular shape having a substantially centrally located rectangular opening along a peripheral portion of the lower polarizer to permit the light to pass through the substantially centrally located rectangular opening..." None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least these features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 6 and claims 7-12, which depend therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

Applicants respectfully submit that in the art of LCD devices, the upper substrate is called a color filter substrate and color filter layers are generally formed on the upper substrate to display color images. See the present application at page 2, line 23 to page 3, line 10. Further the upper substrate generally includes a black matrix layer formed between the color filter layers to block light that passes through the upper substrate other than the color filter layers. Although the claimed invention includes a color filter layer on the upper substrate, the constructive interference generated at a border of the LCD panel may not be prevented and thus the related art LCD device includes the black pad 40. See the present application at page 4, lines 5-23. In the claimed invention, the lower polarizer includes a light shielding layer along a peripheral portion of the lower polarizer to replace the black pad 40 in the related art LCD device.

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner cites Dingwall et al. as teaching the aforementioned feature in claim 6. In particular, the Examiner points to the opaque black mask 235 in Fig. 3 of Dingwall et al. as teaching the “light shielding layer” in claim 6. However, Applicants respectfully submit that, as best understood, the opaque black mask 235 is not different from the black matrix layer formed between the color filter layers in a general LCD device, as Dingwall et al. discloses, “opaque mask is located between each of the image elements to prevent any light bleed-through in these areas” and the opaque mask 235 in Fig. 3 of Dingwall et al. is formed between the color patches 233a, 233b and 233c. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no motivation for one of ordinary skill to combine the cited references and arrive at the claimed invention with any reasonable expectation of success.

New claim 13 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 13 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “...a light shielding material in the lower polarizer and along a peripheral portion of the lower polarizer to minimize constructive interference at a peripheral portion of the LCD device...” An example of support for the aforementioned feature can be found at page 8, lines 6-9. None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least these features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 13 is allowable over the cited references.


Applicants believe the application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the

filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: December 7, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Eric Nuss

Registration No.: 40,106
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorney for Applicant